

**REMARKS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 11, and 19 are amended. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner states that claims 3, 4, 10, 13, 14, and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims;

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's early indication of allowable subject matter.

In response, rather than rewriting any of objected-to claims 3, 4, 10, 13, 14 and 20 in independent form at this time, instead as argued below, the Applicant respectfully submits that each of independent claims 1 and 11 as currently written sets forth a combination of elements that is not suggested by the references cited by the Examiner.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 11 are in condition for allowance.

**Claim for Priority**

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has recognized the Applicant's claim for foreign priority.

**Acknowledgement of Information Disclosure Statement**

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has acknowledged the Information Disclosure Statement filed on January 5, 2004.

**Amendments to the Specification**

Paragraph [0047] is amended merely to correct a typographical error.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

Claims 9 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have amended claims 9 and 19 are revised herein to recite the front wheel supporting arm extends from the axle of the front wheel in a rearward direction.

Support for this amendment can be seen in FIG. 4.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are fully supported by and adequately described in the written description of the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**Objection to the Drawings**

In response to the objection to the drawings, claim 9 and 19 are amended herein. Accordingly, all claimed features are now properly shown in the drawings. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection to the drawings are respectfully requested.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11, 12, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Iwai et al (U.S. 6,336,647). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner will note that each of independent claims 1 and 11 is amended merely to place them in better form. However, each of independent claims 1 and 11 as originally filed sets forth a combination of elements directed to a link-type suspension device in a vehicle, including

a push rod is a split structure including a pair of right and left rod members, lower ends of the rod members being rotatably attached to the front wheel supporting arm, and upper ends of the rod members being rotatably attached to said cushion arm.

Support for the novel features set forth in claims 1 and 11 can be found in paragraphs [0062] and [0063] of the specification, and can be seen in FIG. 4.

As a result of the novel configuration of the present invention, each upper end of the push rod members is directly and rotatably attached to a cushion arm without a rod hanger, and as there are no elements between right and left front forks above a front fender, running air toward the engine for cooling is not restricted.

In comparison with the above, as can be seen in Iwai et al., column 4, lines 56-57, the Iwai et al. device is provided with a rod hanger between the push rod and cushion arm. Each upper end of the rod members (15) are attached to the rod hanger (16). Therefore, in contrast to the present invention, running air will be restricted by the rod hanger (16).

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) are respectfully requested.

All claims of this application are now in condition for allowance.

### **CONCLUSION**

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 and § 1.136(a), Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of three (3) months in which to file a response to the outstanding Office Action. The required fee of \$1,020.00 is attached hereto.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.


*Application No. 10/645,513*  
*Amendment dated January 24, 2005*  
*Reply to Office Action of August 03, 2004*

*Docket No. 0505-1219P*  
*Art Unit: 3611*  
*Page 13 of 13*

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
James M. Slattery  
for Reg. No. 28,380 #43,368

P. O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

  
JMS:CTT/te/mag